

[Sri K. T. Raju] [22nd November 1955]

இருக்கிறது. இதை சர்க்காரும் ஒப்புக்கொள்ளுகிறார்கள். ஆகவே, அது புதிய பிரதேசம், ஆரம்பத்திலேயே, விவசாயிகளுக்கு இப்படிப்பட்ட கடுமையான தண்டத் தீர்வை போடுவது சரியல்ல. அத்துமீறி தண்ணீரை உபயோகப்படுத்தி இருந்தால் அவர்கள் குற்றம் செய்ததாகச் சொல்லலாம். ஒரு சின்ன மதகு, 25 ரூபாய்கூட அதன் கிரயம் ஆகாது. அப்பேர்ப்பட்ட மதகை யாரோ உடைத்ததற்காக, 1,500 ரூபாய் அங்கிருக்கும் விவசாயிகளுக்கு தண்டத் தீர்வை விதித்திருக்கிறார்கள். இப்படி விவசாயிகளைக் கொடுமை படுத்துவது சரியல்ல. கனம் அமைச்சர் அவர்கள், சர்க்கார் இது விஷயமாக பரிசீலித்து ஒரு முடிவுக்கு வரும் வரையில், தண்டத் தீர்வைக்காக ஜப்தி செய்து வருவதற்குத் தற்காலீகமாக நிறுத்தி வைப்பதற்காக ஒரு உத்திரவு பிறப்பிக்கவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : I have to submit, Sir, that this motion will not come under adjournment motion. If the hon. Member switches it off to one under rule 40, I am prepared to make a statement.

SRI K. T. RAJU : I have no objection, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : The Hon. Minister may make a statement to-morrow.

Discussion on the report of the States Reorganization Commission will continue. Dr. K. B. Menon will now speak.

III.—REPORT OF THE STATES RE ORGANIZATION COMMISSION, 1955 (DISCUSSION.—cont.)

* DR. K. B. MENON : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise, if the Hon. Speaker would permit me to move my amendment to the Resolution that was moved by the Hon. the Leader of the House yesterday, for I may not be able to be present throughout the discussion for personal reasons. Whatever I say, I say it with a sense of responsibility and if I am not here to hear the answer of the Hon. the Finance Minister and the Leader of the House, he should not think that I am negligent, that I am irresponsible and that I am running away from the reality.

We would have been more happy, more jubilant, more helpful and more hopeful in criticising the States Reorganization Commission Report if we were confident that our constructive criticisms offered on the floor of the House would receive the weighty consideration that the views of the Opposition should receive from the Party in power. But reading the reports in the newspapers—and probably the Hon. the Leader of the House may object to it—about the proceedings of the Congress Working Committee on the 8th and 9th of this month, one feels rather disappointed, dejected and depressed in offering one's criticism about the States Reorganization Commission Report on the floor of a responsible Assembly. If we are made to feel that the decisions have already been taken, that the imposition of the Report is a foregone conclusion and that the invitation to the Members to discuss the Report is only affording an opportunity for them to let off steam, I am

22nd November 1955] [Dr. K. B. Menon]

sorry that that situation could very well have been saved by the Congress. The reported statement of the Prime Minister made at the meeting of the Congress Working Committee that it was better for the representatives to quietly accept the Report or that if they failed to do so, it would be imposed by him is a statement which staggers the nation. Claiming to be a democrat and going about the world as a proud representative of the biggest and the best democracy, if he makes such a statement, one is surprised to hear him say that in an affair which should be dealt with not at the Party level. It is an issue which is going to determine the fate of the whole of India for centuries to come. In an affair of that kind it is, to say the least, very disappointing to hear him say that he would impose it if it is not submissively accepted. The Congress Working Committee is a political caucus and when a political caucus assumes the responsibility of a supreme elected body in the State, one feels again disappointed about the future of our democracy. I wish that that kind of a situation or impression was avoided by the Prime Minister.

Coming to the Report itself, whatever the Hon. the Leader of the House might have said yesterday, I still wish to state that it could have been delayed, that the Congress is showing indecent haste in pushing it through, that it could have bided time, allowed passions and emotions to settle down and selected a better time when it could be discussed without rousing passions and emotions. The division of the country into the States that are there to-day has a history that dates back to a couple of centuries, to the days of British administration, and it has worked fairly well whatever be its defects for these two centuries. I see no reason why it cannot be worked for another couple of decades giving the nation a better chance to discuss the Report and creating a better situation to implement it. I also feel that the fate of the country should not have been left in the hands of three members of a Commission. I also feel that the Commission has not stuck to the terms of reference that were given to it. The safety, unity and security of the State were given supreme importance in the terms of reference to the Commission. That, I feel, has been completely neglected. I feel also that whatever the Commission may say and whatever lip objections it may raise to the linguistic division of the country, basically the division has been effected on the linguistic ground. With the exception of two States, namely, Pepsu and Bombay, the division of the rest of the country has been on a linguistic basis. There also it may be revised. But whatever it may be, that is the main basis on which the division has been made. I feel that that is very unfortunate. I see a family resemblance between the demand for a linguistic division of the State and the demand made in the early days of the struggle by Mr. Jinnah for a division of the State on a religious basis. Hindu India was shocked and surprised when Mr. Jinnah supported by Dr. Ambedkar and a great statesman of the South said that a division should be made on the ground that the Muslims were not safe in the hands of the Hindus. To-day whatever lip loyalty

[Dr. K. B. Menon] [22nd November 1955]

we may show, however much we may say that we do not want a linguistic division and that we stand for the unity of India and whatever lip service we may do to that unity, the fact remains that one language group does not feel safe to live in the State of another language group.

10-40
a.m.

When a Tamil language speaking person or villager does not feel safe in the Kerala State and a few Kerala State people do not feel safe in Tamilnad, I do not know where our Union is drifting to. I wish to repeat over and over again that it is just like saying that "Brutus was an honourable man", that our Union should survive, etc. If this report of the States Reorganization Commission is implemented, it is like releasing the evil spirits in Pandora's Box. We will be unleashing passions emotions in this country which it will be difficult for us to control. Already, even the announcement of the recommendations have created in different parts of the country a tension and a feeling that people are finding it difficult to control. It will be more so in the future as we progress in the implementation of the report. Therefore, my submission is that the report should be revised, that it should not be implemented as it is, that the basis of language must be shifted and that our primary consideration should be the unity, safety and security of a State.

I shall proceed next to a discussion of the report itself. I have fairly studied the report. If we take a cursory look at the map of India as divided by the States Reorganization Commission's report, it is obvious that the two or three giant states like the Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Bombay, cover nearly half the map of India and the remaining twelve or sixteen States are scattered in the south. I would ask the simple question "What are the repercussions of this on democracy?" I would like to maintain that the maintenance of such giant States controlling the major votes of the country is a denial or negation of democracy. If I quote figures (of course, I am quoting merely from memory), even to-day the State of Uttar Pradesh has 96 members in the Lok Sabha and 36 members in the Rajya Sabha. Nearly 100 members will be representing Madhya Pradesh and so, a couple of hundred votes in the Union Parliament controlled by these two States are going to determine the destiny of the country. What about the future of the Southern States? The Dravida Kazhagam was talking of the domination of the north over the south. It is the States Reorganization Commission that is now imposing the north over the south. As and when this unequal division into the States takes place, I am perfectly sure that the splintered votes of the south will be ineffective against the combined votes of the north. Now, we are quarrelling over trivials. I have heard the discussions in the House yesterday. We are quarrelling over boundary disputes which are after all insignificant. I am not perturbed by those responsible for the States Reorganization Report. I am not prepared as a Malayalee to fly at the throat of the Tamilians because I want this taluk, that village and so on. I stand for a more major issue. I would like to point out in this connection

22nd November 1955] [Dr. K. B. Menon]

to the Constitution of the United States or even the Constitution of the dictatorship of Russia or the Weimar constitution. In all these constitutions, provision is made for equalizing the votes of the State, for emphasising the voice of the small States. A similar provision was made in the Russian constitution. A similar provision was made even in the dictatorial Weimar constitution of which Hitler became the controlling hand. In India, we have no such safeguards. We have no equal rights for the States in the Council of States. The big States that will be controlling the destiny of the country will be dominating both in the Lok Sabha and in the Rajya Sabha. Where is democracy then? What is our future? What does citizenship mean if in our own country, if after having fought for the freedom of the country, if after making all the sacrifices that one should do as a nation, we are to barter it away because of the report of the States Reorganization Commission? We are asked to accept the report and if we do not accept it, we are told that it will be imposed on us. I wish to repeat, Sir, that this States Reorganization Report is sowing the seeds of disunity, discontent and disruption of the Union in the future.

Then, Sir, I am very sorry to say that the Hon. the Leader of the House, Sri Subramaniam, forgot in a fit of emotion, his sense of responsibility to the House and his responsibility to the State. I may also add that he forgot his sense of responsibility to the people of Malabar. I am talking with extreme sense of responsibility, not with passion, not with anger but with sorrow and sadness for, I think, that if he wanted to talk of Tamilnad and if he was very enthusiastic, I can very well understand it. Similarly, I have my own loyalty to Malabar. He should have remembered that Malabar to-day is an integral part of the Madras State and has been so for the last two centuries. Malayalees, whatever might have been their mistakes, acts of omission and commission the fact remains that they have tried to serve the State with loyalty for these two centuries. The minimum that they deserve is some consideration at this time when they are asked to leave their old homes. Whatever be the conditions, they should not be made to feel that Madras State has forgotten them, that Madras State is not fair and just to them. Sri Subramaniam, when he talked yesterday, brought in certain arguments. I am prepared to discuss with him and prove to him that he was not quite fair. I would have understood all that if he had not attempted to introduce the States Reorganization Report and moved the resolution of acceptance. As the head of the State and as an important executive arm of the State, I think, he should simply have moved it and said nothing more. But, I would have preferred that no Member of the Cabinet had talked in that strain about Malabar because, after all, they should accept that Malabar to-day is a part of the Madras State, that Malabar holds nothing against Tamilnad. If we face that problem from that humanitarian point of view, I am quite sure that Mr. Subramaniam would not have said what he said yesterday.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: May I know to what exact suggestion which I made, the hon. Member is objecting to?

10-50
a.m.

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [22nd November 1955]

As far as I could recollect, I have not made any suggestion which would jeopardise or injure or prejudice the position of Malabar either in this State or in the future Kerala State. If he is taking objection to what I stated with regard to Peermade and Devikulam, it is not a matter concerning Malabar as such.

* DR. K. B. MENON : I want to avoid getting into the details but I would have preferred to discuss it with Sri Subramaniam over a cup of tea at a table. I am prepared to defend it there and if I am at fault, I am prepared to say : ' I have made a mistake and I am sorry about it. Please pardon me '. I am absolutely willing to do it. As I have already stated, I am not speaking with passion or emotion. I have questioned the very basis of the Report of the States Reorganization Commission and I have stated that the linguistic division is wrong and that it should not be there. After hearing the whole argument yesterday, if only we had a machine to record the rising tempo, emotion and passion exhibited in this House, we would have felt how the Tamilians were feeling and how the Malayalees were feeling. I was quietly watching it and I did not even ask that embarrassing question which the hon. Leader of the Opposition put—not because it did not suggest to me but because I did not want to embarrass him and the public.

Argument was also advanced on the ground of administrative convenience. Malabar has been included in the Madras State for administrative convenience for the last two centuries and to-day for the same administrative convenience, it has been argued that part of Malabar must be taken over to the Tamilnad. I personally have no objection to it if the facts justify it. As I said before, I am opposed to the very fundamental principle of dividing States on a linguistic basis, for which I shall give many reasons. In order to suit his own desire to serve the Tamil people, I understand, he dwelt on the theory of self-sufficiency and said that the Tamil Nad has no forest areas and so they must go to Tamil Nad. Sir, these are very dangerous theories to project. These indicate dangerous tendencies. If we are going to develop that theory, that every State in the Union should be self-sufficient, I think, that itself will lead us to logical conclusions which we ourselves may not be willing to accept.

As far as the southern portion of the Travancore-Cochin State is concerned, I am not in a position to say anything definitely about it because I have no information. But I know every foot of Malabar and the Madras State and from that I also know that from the place " Top Slip " near the Coimbatore district, water has to be diverted to Coimbatore for drinking purposes. I will have no objection and I will be the first person to continue that facility if that is necessary. There is also one place called " Muthukulam ", about which there is a lot of controversy. Sri Kumaraswami Rajah himself visited that place. When Rajaji was the Chief Minister of this State, I suggested to him that water that is not needed in Malabar should be diverted to Tamil Nad. I am saying this on authority and I can show it in the proceedings

22nd November 1955] [Dr. K. B. Menon]

of this House. Therefore, it is a matter about which we can sit and discuss at a round table and thrash out things. These are not matters about which emotion need be whipped up. The Hon. Leader of the House was very silent about the Gudalur taluk until the issue was raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. So, in the presentation of the Report, he was not very fair to Malabar. If there is any difficulty, that could be solved. Sir, Malabar is opposed to the linguistic division of States because Malayalees are the smallest of the thirteen linguistic groups in India. If India is divided on a linguistic basis, the Kerala State will be the smallest State in the country and it can never be a viable unit. We protested against the linguistic division as early as 1948 because 13.6 million people will have to huddle together in about 14,000 square miles of territory. Tamil Nad has an area of about 50,000 square miles and its 30 million people can afford to be generous to the Kerala State with a crowded population and limited territory. Even in these 14,000 square miles of territory, much of it is taken by hills and dales, where it is not possible for the people to live in. They do not have a standing room—let alone a living space—and that is the main reason why the people of Malabar are objecting to this linguistic division and claiming that if the Kerala State is to be formed, as far as conditions would permit, it should be as big as possible. That is why we have advocated the formation of a West Coast State. Once we also talked of the Travancore-Cochin State merging with the Madras State.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI: Sir, having heard Mr. Menon so much, I would request him to clarify one point, viz., whether the views that he is expressing on the floor of this House also represent the views of the Party of which he is a distinguished Member.

* DR. K. B. MENON: I said in the very beginning that I am not speaking my personal view because personal views do not count or count very little. I have some authority at my back and as a responsible member of my Party, I certainly voice the opinion of the Party and also—as far as I can sense it—the voice of the people of Malabar. I suppose that satisfies the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

I think I have made the position very clear as to why we are opposed to the linguistic division and why we want a West Coast State or some larger State where we will have at least standing room and I say that the Kerala State is not a viable unit. Therefore, as long as we are part of India and as long as we are within the Union, it is the responsibility of the Centre to definitely come forward and say and incorporate in the Constitution that they are responsible for the full growth and development of the Kerala State. The natural and human resources of Malabar alone will not have any opportunity of expression unless these conditions are satisfied. With these words, I move my amendment, viz.,

“Add at the end the following:—

‘and on such consideration this House rejects the same.’”

The amendment was duly seconded.

[22nd November 1955]

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM: Mr. Speaker, Sir, under ordinary circumstances I would have spoken only on the last day of the discussion. But I preferred to speak to-day for various reasons. Sir, I was cautiously following what Dr. Menon was saying about the States Reorganization Commission Report. May I submit not only to men of his type but also to those who talk of unity and safety of this country that it is too late now to say anything against the States Reorganization Commission Report. The division of the country on linguistic basis has come to stay and it is going to be achieved before we face the electorate during the coming general elections. But my personal view about this report is that no useful purpose will be served by any discussion on it for it is the Congress High Command that decides the issues raised in the report for our country and any discussion either in the local Assemblies or even in the Parliament only amounts to a political farce. Even the Parliament has been neglected. Sir, to counteract my arguments, the exponents of the Congress Party may say that after all it is the majority party that rules and decides the issues for the country.

Sir, I view this entire report from a Tamilian point of view. Let me make it very clear that point and I am not hiding the aspect in which I look at this report. The Members who constituted this Commission are no-doubt eminent men. I do not question their political honesty or sagacity. When matters relating to Bihar were discussed, Sir Fazl Ali, an eminent jurist who was the Chairman of the Commission was kind enough to withdraw from the discussion so that his personal touch would not have much bearing on the report. Likewise, Sri K. M. Panikkar, whose honesty I do not doubt and for whose political sagacity I take my hat off, should have withdrawn from the discussion whenever matters concerning Malabar and Madras were discussed. But, Sir, for what reasons he took part in the discussions, though as a Member of the Commission it was his personal right to take part in the discussions, I do not know. If he had withdrawn from the discussion, then there would not have been much room to suspect as to how the report has been drafted, as for instance when matters concerning Devikulam and Peermade were discussed. I will tackle this report as a whole and not as a contribution of Mr. Panikkar in the report. There are contradictory statements in many places in the report. To quote a Biblical saying that even a Devil will quote scriptures to suit its own purposes, wherever linguistic majorities suited the purpose of the Commission they have said that it is the language that decides and wherever it goes against the interests of certain individuals or States in whom they are interested they have said that language should not be the main criterion to decide the future of that particular area. In this connection, particular reference may be made about Devikulam taluk. Under what principle the five southernmost taluks are proposed to be merged with the Madras State? It is purely on the language basis. But when it is the case of Devikulam, the Commission argues that the Tamilian population in that taluk is a floating

22nd November 1955] [Sri K. Vinayakam]

population. After the arguments ably advanced by the Hon. Leader of the House, I do not think that I will enrich the debate by reiterating his own arguments. He has ably argued that the floating population theory is a nebulous one and that it has no political conception. People who have been living in that area for the last 20 or 30 years cannot be considered as floating population. They have found their places in the electoral rolls and they have sent their own representatives to the local Assembly. It is too late for the Commission to talk of floating population. The Census figures for the past thirty years definitely go to show that there has been infiltration more from Travancore State into this area rather than from the Madras State into this area under reference. I am to understand that even the State language in Travancore before 50 years was Tamil. It is evidenced by the State Gazettes. Sri Nagam Ayya's Travancore State Manual makes it clear that the administrative language of Travancore-Cochin State was Tamil before 50 years. So, the infiltration has come more from the West rather than from the East. Even the geographical environment goes to show that the terrain slowly ascends from the East towards the West in Devikulam and Peermede taluks and on the western side it is a steep descent towards the West. Even the geographical surroundings strengthen our argument that Devikulam and Peermede have got to go with the Madras State.

Now I come to Neyyathinkara and Chittur areas. Proper evidence was let in before the Commission by the leaders of the Travancore-Tamilnad Congress Committee that these areas should go to the Madras State. Before the census of those areas was taken, the T.T.N.C. leaders had been going about telling the Tamilian population to register themselves as Tamilians and not classify themselves as Malayalees. But the Government there launched cases against such propagandists and relevant evidence was let in before the Commission in this connection. But the Commission brushed aside their evidence and used nebulous arguments saying that the population figures are in favour of Malayalees. Similarly in the case of Chittur taluk, we are not claiming the entire taluk but only the eastern portion of Chittur taluk abutting Coimbatore district which is predominantly a Tamil area. There are 19 villages which are predominantly Tamilian in character. I had the opportunity of visiting this area. The western area has a predominantly Malayalee population. We will be asking too much if we claim the entire Chittur taluk. We are only asking that portion of Chittur taluk which is predominantly a Tamil area. Sir, our friends from Malabar district are all thinking that we are claiming too much when we say that Tamil areas of Palghat taluk should be added on to this State. When we have decided to divide the country on language basis, it is nothing but logic, it is nothing but fair-play that contiguous areas which are predominantly Tamilian in character should be added on to this State. Some of us who have toured these areas have come to the conclusion that from Palghat towards the east it is a

[Sri K. Vinayakam] [22nd November 1955]

11-10
a.m. contiguous area abutting Coimbatore district and this is predominantly a Tamil area. Necessary steps have got to be taken by the Government to include such Tamil areas. Sir, I would have been glad if the Government had come forward with an official resolution agreeing with the sum total of this Report, at the same time requesting the Central Government to appoint a Boundary Commission for getting the Tamil areas annexed to the Madras State. I do not know why they have not brought a resolution of this type. In the Andhra Assembly, the Government there are bringing such a resolution. In the Travancore-Cochin Assembly also, a similar resolution is being moved. In the Mysore Assembly they have attempted to move a resolution of this kind. I am at a loss to understand why the Madras Government are hesitating to bring in such a resolution.

After perusing the entire Report, I came to the conclusion that from the point of view of the Tamilians, this Report has done great injustice to us and is a document of political dishonesty. When linguistic States are being formed all over the country, why should the same privilege be denied to Madras State? I would have welcomed if the Commission had suggested that Madras State should be named as "Tamil Nad" or "Tamilagam" after the linguistic division. Our State should be named after our language. I have seen some Cabinet Ministers of very good reputation going about and saying "What is the glamour attachment to the name 'Tamil Nad'?" They further say "We would rather prefer to have this State called as Madras State". May I submit, Sir, in all humility that it does no credit to us to still retain the name of Madras. Madras is the name of a foreigner, a Dutch settler. I would request the Hon. the Leader of the House to go through the records that are in the possession of the Government to find out how this place acquired the name of Madras. The Government have issued a pamphlet and the Corporation of Madras have also issued a pamphlet over this matter. There are records which go to prove that Madras is the name of a Dutch settler. They are trying to camouflage the issue. I would request the Government to prevail upon the Central Government that our State should be named under the name and style of "Tamil Nad". Now I come to more interesting subjects as far as I am concerned.

I draw the attention of the hon. the Leader of the House to paragraphs 395 and 396 of the Report which deal with the northern boundaries of our State. The Report makes it clear that in pursuance of the statement made by the Prime Minister on the floor of Parliament on March 25, 1953, a Boundary Commission will be appointed to demarcate the boundaries between the two States, namely, Madras and Andhra. They have also suggested that if agreement could be reached by mutual talks between the two Governments, the boundary issue may be settled, but in the event of a failure to come to an agreement, the Central Government will come forward to appoint a Boundary Commission. This is a vexatious problem. This problem has been hanging in the air for the past two years and what steps our Government have taken the

22nd November 1955] [Sri K. Vinayakam]

country is not aware of. But some steps have been taken in this regard, namely, the appointment of a Superintendent to re-sort the census slips on the basis of the 1951 census and graphs and maps have been drawn so far as the disputed areas are concerned. Only when people agitate in the country and only when the Government come to know that people are impatient about solving the problem the Government seem to move in the direction. The Report states that the Commission will not express any opinion as long as the two Governments are negotiating between themselves to solve this problem. But what are the steps which our Government are taking? They have taken two years to draw these charts and maps. Re-sorting of census slips has been completed. Only last month, I believe, the representatives of the Andhra and Madras Governments met together in Madras. It was made clear to us on the floor of this House when we met last time that the talks would be at the ministerial level. That means that no outsider or non-official will be allowed to take part in the talks. On behalf of the Madras Government, three eminent Ministers took part in the talks but from the Andhra side besides three Ministers, a non-official also participated. I was told that he is the Leader of the Congress Party of Andhra Desa and that gentleman was allowed to participate in the talks to support the arguments advanced by the Andhra Ministers. Sir, I take a very strong attitude in this matter. It amounts to belittling the prestige of our State. When the Madras Ministers did not take any non-official to advise them on this issue, they should not have allowed a non-official from the Andhra side to take part in the discussion. Having known the Andhras pretty well, having lived with them for so many years and having known their outlook well, I know that all these talks will come to a deadlock. During my private conversation with the Hon. the Chief Minister and the Hon. the Leader of the House, I told them that their talks will end in a deadlock. I know what the Andhras are. They have argued the case of Hosur during the talks. I am sure that our Government should not have allowed that topic to be discussed. What for were they meeting? They were meeting to solve their boundary dispute. Is the problem of Hosur a boundary dispute? Hosur is a taluk which is at one end of our State adjoining Mysore. When the representatives of Andhra raised this subject of Hosur, our Government must have taken a stiffer attitude and said "This is not a boundary dispute as far as you are concerned. This is a boundary dispute so far as the Mysore Government are concerned, if they raise it." That is the attitude which they should have taken. They should not have even gone into the merits of the question. They should not have talked about the percentage of the population of the various linguistic groups and about the contiguity of that area. All these things were unwarranted. They should have openly told the Andhra Ministers "It is not your business to talk about Hosur". They could have talked about Krishnagiri if they had a case. The Andhra Ministers are fully aware of the fact that they will not get even one village from the Krishnagiri taluk. Just to throw the responsibility on somebody else, the Andhras have invented this

[Sri K. Vinayakam] [22nd November 1955]

11-20
a.m.

curious argument of multi-lingual areas like Hosur. I was sure that neither the Madras Government nor the Andhra Government wanted to take the responsibility upon themselves to solve this problem. What is it they are doing? They are just manœuvring and playing a political game, telling the Central Government "We are friendly. We want to solve our problem between ourselves". That is the game which our Government and the Andhra Government are trying to play. They are not prepared to solve this problem. So I said even earlier that the Madras Government should write to the Central Government to appoint an impartial Boundary Commission, as the two Governments could not come to an agreement. Whatever may be the decision of that Commission, it will be final according to the statement made by the Prime Minister in Parliament in August 1953. I remember the Hon. Mr. Subramaniam in a statement on the floor of this House said that this Government would solve this problem by the end of this year. I may remind him that not more than forty days are there for the close of this year. From newspaper reports it appears that the Andhra Government have almost come to the conclusion that they are not going to negotiate with our Government and that they are going to write to the Central Government for the appointment of a Boundary Commission. The official resolution which the Andhra Government are bringing before the Andhra Assembly for consideration goes to show that they are not coming back to Madras for discussion. Let our Ministers be practical, let them wake up from their slumber and solve this problem quickly. I hope the Madras Government will not wait for the solution of this problem until there is an upsurge or unrest on the part of the affected people in the border areas.

I might bring to the notice of this House at this pertinent juncture that the Andhra Government are trying to terrorise the Tamilian population by making a claim for a larger area. When they say that they will take Hosur, Krishnagiri, Gudiyatham, Ponneri and Trivellore, no Tamilian need be disturbed over their tall claim. They are claims without any basis. The Madras Government have gone through the census slips and maps and they are in possession of full information. In Tiruttani taluk of Chittoor district, seventy-three per cent of the population are Tamilians and Tiruttani is almost entirely Tamilian. Even the rule of contiguity is satisfied. Inside the taluk, there are small Telugu-majority pockets here and there. But on the borders we have got villages with a vast Tamil-majority population. So no one need be alarmed over the Andhra Government's tall claim.

Coming to Chittoor, as we approach that town from Vellore, we are in a definite majority up to Chittoor. Even in Chittoor town, the Tamilians are four thousand more in number than the Telugus. The census slips have been prepared not by the Madras or the Andhra Government but by the Central Government and nobody need dispute the census figures. The leaders in Andhra Desa were under the impression that they were going to get more than what they were going to lose. That was the impression created in that

22nd November 1955] [Sri K. Vinayakam]

State. They went through the census slips, came to certain conclusions and found that, according to the mutual talks, they would have to give more portion than what they anticipated. They created a wrong impression and got into a mess. To get out of the mess and to see that they will not have any trouble in the forthcoming elections, they want to throw the responsibility on a boundary commission. As far as Chittoor is concerned, the Madras Government must take up a stiffer attitude. I do not want them to be intransigent or plead for unjust causes. The rule of contiguity also is satisfied. Chittoor must be ours under any circumstances. In Tiruttani taluk, we should claim up to the village of Puttur.

As regards Tirupati, I admit that the census figures show that the Tamilians are in a minority compared to the Telugu people. But that is due to infiltration from the north. But now we cannot be arguing as to who were infiltrating, who had been doing mischief and all these things. We shall take the present position as it is. The rights of the minority living in Tirupati have got to be safeguarded and we will provide the safeguard either by mutual settlement or through the agency of a boundary commission.

Our Government should have a voice in the administration of the temple at Tirupati. Tirupati temple is not the sole property of the Andhras alone. It is an All-India pilgrim centre and an All-India property. People from Tamil, Telugu, Karnataka and other areas visit the temple. So the Madras Government must adopt a very firm attitude and fight for the nomination of their representatives to the board of administration of the temple.

The Tirupati University is now fast becoming a Telugu University. The authorities are trying to oust our Tamil students. They have already closed the Tamil section this year. Till last year, they had a separate Chair for Tamil. This year they have abolished it. They know that there is a weak-kneed Government here and not a strong Government to fight for the cause of Tamilians living there. I find out leaders go about saying : Let us be very fair to the Telugus here. We are very fair. Who said that we are denying them any rights here? I have known some prominent leaders of the Telugu community in Madras convening meetings and saying that Telugu is in danger. This is nothing but bunkum. This is merely taking advantage of our weakness. I submit that the Madras Government should take serious steps for protecting the rights of the Tamilian minorities in the district.

I have given notice of three amendments to the motion. One proposes the naming of the State as " Tamil Nad ". I believe the Legislature Parties have given freedom of voting to their members. I understand from newspapers that the Congress Party has given freedom of voting to its members. I appeal to the Members of the Congress Party to avail themselves of that freedom and vote for this amendment.

[Sri K. Vinayakam] [22nd November 1955]

The next amendment is self-explanatory. Nobody could have done better justice than the Hon. Leader of the House as far as the disputed areas in the south and south-west are concerned.

Coming to the last amendment which stands in my name, I have advanced enough arguments to show that mutual talks which our Ministers are trying to have with the Andhra Ministers will always be beset with a deadlock. I believe the Andhra Ministers have promised that they will write to our Ministers before the end of November. They are too busy with Visalandhra and so they may not be concerned with the small disputed areas in the south. They are jubilant over their getting the Visalandhra. So they may even adopt an intransigent attitude towards the Tamil-Andhra border issues. There are hardly eight days before the close of this month. If our Government do not hear anything from the Andhra Government before the end of the month, they should write to the Central Government asking for the appointment of a boundary commission. I give the assurance on behalf of the people living in the disputed areas that the decision of the commission shall be accepted as final even if it is to the detriment of our interests. With these words I move—

Add at the end the following :—

“ and on such consideration this House recommends to the Central Government that with the implementation of the recommendations of the States Reorganization Commission, this State be named as ‘ Tamil Nad ’ instead of Madras State ”.

Add at the end the following :—

“ and on such consideration this House agrees with the recommendations of the States Reorganization Commission regarding the inclusion of the five taluks of Agastheeswaram, Thovala, Kalkulam, Vilavancode, Shencotta in Madras State and recommends to the Central Government to include the entire taluks of Devikulam and Peermade and predominantly Tamil-speaking areas of Neyyathinkara and Chittur of Travancore-Cochin State and Palghat taluks of Malabar district in the Madras State ”.

Add at the end the following :—

“ and on such consideration this House recommends to the Government of India to appoint an impartial boundary commission to settle the future of predominantly Tamil-speaking areas of Chittoor district of Andhra ”.

SRI K. R. SAMBANDAM : I second the amendments.

IV.—SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : A large number of members are eager to participate in the discussion of the motion regarding the report of the States Reorganization Commission, and so there is a suggestion that the time allotted for this debate may be extended by one day. The suggestion was agreed to by the Hon. Leader of the House. May I know what his decision is?